

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
January 14, 2008

Date of Deposit

John R. Lagowski, Reg. No. 41,922

Name of applicant, assignee or  
Registered Representative

Signature

Signature\_\_\_\_\_

January 14, 2008

Date of Signature

Attorney Docket No. MP0973 (13036/14)

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application of:

Mark Melvin Butterworth

Serial No. 10/092,772

Filing Date: March 7, 2002

For: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR  
PERFORMING OPTICAL  
CHARACTER RECOGNITION  
(OCR) AND TEXT STITCHING

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

Examiner: Sath V. Perungavoor

Group Art Unit No.: 2624

## COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

MAIL STOP ISSUE FEE  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:


Reasons for allowance are only warranted in instances in which “the record of the prosecution as a whole does not make clear the Examiner's reasons for allowing a claim or claims.” 37 C.F.R. 1.104(e). In the present case, Applicant believes the record as a whole makes clear the reasons for allowance and therefore no statement by the Examiner is necessary or warranted. Therefore, the record should reflect that Applicant does not necessarily agree with the statements in the reasons for allowance.

For example, the Examiner's statement that the "instant invention directed toward combining images" is an overly generalized characterization of the allowed claims and is not necessary. Also, the Examiner's statement that there "is no strong motivation to combine the references to arrive at the claimed invention" does not accurately reflect the record. For example, it was argued that at least one of the references cited by the Examiner taught away from the modification/combination cited by the Examiner. Also, Applicant successfully argued in the Pre-Appeal Brief that the Examiner's interpretation of another reference was clearly erroneous. Applicant believes that the prosecution record makes clear the reasons for allowance and that the Examiner's Statement mischaracterizes the prosecution record.

Applicant's claims should be limited only by the terms utilized therein. Thus, Applicant hereby submits these Comments in an effort to ensure that the claims are properly construed based only upon limitations that are actually present and recited by the Claims 1, 4-7, 9-13, and 15-17 and/or to ensure that the Claims 1, 4-7, 9-13, and 15-17 are not interpreted so as to include any additional limitations that are not found in the respective claims.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application; the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned. If necessary, the Office is hereby directed and authorized in this, concurrent, and future papers, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1925 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,



---

John R. Lagowski  
Registration No. 41,922  
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. BOX 10395  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610  
(312) 321-4200